

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN**

MONICA D. NASH,

Plaintiff,

v.

Case No. 24-CV-890

MILWAUKEE COUNTY, et al.

Defendants.

**ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFF'S REQUEST TO PROCEED IN
DISTRICT COURT WITHOUT PREPAYING THE FILING FEE AND
RECOMMENDATION THAT THE COMPLAINT BE DISMISSED**

Currently pending before the court is the Monica D. Nash's Request to Proceed in District Court without Prepaying the Filing Fee.

Having reviewed the plaintiff's request, the court concludes that the plaintiff lacks the financial resources to prepay the fees and costs associated with this action. Therefore, the plaintiff's Request to Proceed in District Court without Prepaying the Filing Fee will be granted.

However, because the court is granting the plaintiff's Request to Proceed in District Court without Prepaying the Filing Fee, it must determine whether the

complaint is legally sufficient to proceed. 28 U.S.C. § 1915. Congress sought to ensure that no citizen would be denied the opportunity to commence a civil action in any court of the United States solely due to poverty. *Denton v. Hernandez*, 504 U.S. 25, 31 (1992) (quoting *Adkins v. E. I. DuPont de Nemours & Co.*, 335 U.S. 331, 342 (1948)). However, Congress also recognized that “a litigant whose filing fees and court costs are assumed by the public, unlike a paying litigant, lacks an economic incentive to refrain from filing frivolous, malicious, or repetitive lawsuits.” *Id.* (quoting *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 324 (1989)). To balance these competing concerns, before the court can allow a plaintiff to proceed in forma pauperis it must determine that the case neither (1) is frivolous or malicious, (2) fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted, nor (3) seeks monetary relief against a defendant who is immune from such relief. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2). Thus, although “a pro se complaint, however inartfully pleaded, must be held to less stringent standards than formal pleadings drafted by lawyers,” *Erickson v. Pardus*, 551 U.S. 89, 94 (2007) (quoting *Estelle v. Gamble*, 429 U.S. 97, 106 (1976)), a pro se complaint must meet these minimal standards before the court shall grant a plaintiff leave to proceed in forma pauperis.

A claim is legally frivolous when it lacks an arguable basis either in law or in fact. *Denton*, 504 U.S. at 31; *Neitzke*, 490 U.S. at 325. Although factual allegations must be weighed in favor of the plaintiff, that does not mean that the court is required to accept without question the truth of the plaintiff's allegations. *Denton*, 504 U.S. at 32. Thus, a

court may dismiss a claim as frivolous if it is “clearly baseless,” “fanciful,” “fantastic,” “delusional,” “irrational,” “wholly incredible,” or “based on an indisputably meritless legal theory.” *Id.* at 32-33. A court may not dismiss a claim as frivolous simply because “the plaintiff’s allegations are unlikely.” *Id.*

A claim might not be frivolous or malicious but nonetheless fail to state a claim upon which relief may be granted and, therefore, be subject to dismissal. In determining whether a complaint is sufficient to state a claim under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(ii), the court applies the same well-established standards applicable to a motion to dismiss pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6). *DeWalt v. Carter*, 224 F.3d 607, 611 (7th Cir. 2000), *abrogated on other grounds by Savory v. Cannon*, 947 F.3d 409 (7th Cir. 2020).

Under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8(a)(2), a complaint must contain a “short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief.” Although the allegations in a complaint need not be detailed, a complaint “demands more than an unadorned, the-defendant-unlawfully-harmed-me accusation. A pleading that offers labels and conclusions or a formulaic recitation of the elements of a cause of action will not do. Nor does a complaint suffice if it tenders naked assertions devoid of further factual enhancement.” *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009) (internal quotation marks, citation, and brackets omitted). The complaint must be sufficiently detailed “to give the defendant fair notice of what the claim is and the grounds upon

which it rests.” *Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 555 (2007) (quoting *Conley v. Gibson*, 355 U.S. 41, 47 (1957)) (quotation marks and ellipses omitted).

If the complaint contains well-pleaded non-frivolous factual allegations, the court should assume the veracity of those allegations and “then determine whether they plausibly give rise to an entitlement to relief.” *Iqbal*, 556 U.S. at 679. “Determining whether a complaint states a plausible claim for relief will ... be a context-specific task that requires the reviewing court to draw on its judicial experience and common sense.” *Id.*

With the standards set forth in 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2) in mind, the court turns to the allegations raised in the plaintiff’s complaint. Nash alleges she was the victim of a crime and the defendants conspired to cover it up. Nash has already filed another lawsuit against the same defendants regarding this incident. *See* 24-cv-442-JPS, *Nash v. Bacich*. Filing multiple lawsuits regarding the same underlying events is inefficient for the court and the parties, creates the risk of inconsistent judgments, and opens the door to abuses, such as judge shopping, *see* Civ. L.R. 41(e). Therefore, courts may dismiss duplicative lawsuits. *See McReynolds v. Merrill Lynch & Co.*, 694 F.3d 873, 888 (7th Cir. 2012); *Hye-Young Park v. Bd. of Trs. of the Univ. of Ill.*, No. 18-CV-2090, 2018 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 243261, at *3-4 (C.D. Ill. May 7, 2018).

There is no indication that the allegations in the present complaint, insofar as they vary at all from those presented in 24-CV-442, could not be included in that action. Therefore, the court will recommend that this action be dismissed.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that the plaintiff's Request to Proceed in District Court without Prepaying the Filing Fee (ECF No. 2) is **granted**.

IT IS FURTHER RECOMMENDED that the complaint and this action be dismissed as duplicative to the matter pending in case number 24-cv-442 (E.D. Wis.).

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that all of the plaintiff's filings with the court shall be mailed to the following address:

Office of the Clerk
United States District Court
Eastern District of Wisconsin
362 United States Courthouse
517 E. Wisconsin Avenue
Milwaukee, WI 53202

DO NOT MAIL ANYTHING DIRECTLY TO CHAMBERS. It will only delay the processing of the matter.

The plaintiff should also retain a personal copy of each document.

The plaintiff is further advised that the failure to comply with all deadlines in this matter may have serious consequences, which may include the loss of certain rights or the dismissal of this action.

In addition, the plaintiff must immediately notify the Clerk of Court of any change of address. Failure to do so could result in orders or other information not being timely delivered, thus affecting the legal rights of the parties.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that, in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and (C) and Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(2), any written objections to any recommendation herein or part thereof shall be filed within fourteen days of service of this recommendation. Failure to timely object waives a party's right to review.

Dated at Milwaukee, Wisconsin this 22nd day of July, 2024.


WILLIAM E. DUFFIN
U.S. Magistrate Judge